



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/024,849	12/18/2001	Gerard Pucheu-Marque	28944/40018	6145
29471 7590 03/18/2008 MCCRACKEN & FRANK LLP 311 S. WACKER DRIVE SUITE 2500 CHICAGO, IL 60606				
EXAMINER				
HALIYUR, VENKATESH N				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2619				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/18/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/024,849

Applicant(s)

PUCHEU-MARQUE, GERAD

Examiner

VENKATESH HALIYUR

Art Unit

2619

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Amendment filed on 12/13/2007 has been considered and is effective to overcome Grilli et al reference. Therefore the rejection of claims 1-11 communicated via previous office action of 6/11/2007 has been withdrawn. However a new ground(s) of rejection has been made in this office action in view of Grilli et al and a newly found reference Raith. Rejection follows.
2. Claims 1-11 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grilli et al [US Pat: 6,438,117] in view of Raith [US Pat: 6,073,005].

5. Regarding claims 1, 8, 10, Grilli et al in the invention of "Base Station Synchronization for Handover in a Hybrid GSM/CDMA Network" disclosed a method **(Figs 4A-4C)** for allocating radio resources for the establishment of an outgoing call originating from a mobile terminal **(MS, item 40 of Fig 4B)** of a first system for radio communications **(CDMA BSS, item 32 of Fig 4B)** with mobiles having a given radio interface and mobile terminal initiates communication over the air interface **(in an overlapping CDMA and GSM systems, col 13, lines 44-55, Figs 2A, 8, 14)** via a base station of a second system **(GSM BSS, item 30 of Fig 4B)** for radio communications with mobiles said second system **(GSM/TDMA)** being distinct from said first system **(CDMA, col 16, lines 61-67, col 17, lines 1-15)**, and said first and second systems comprising respective terminals and base stations and having respective radio interface which are mutually incompatible **(col 22, lines 5-36)**, wherein the base station carries out the steps of **(col 3, lines 61-67, col 4, lines 1-61)**: a) monitoring signals transmitted by the mobile station in the first system **(col 22, lines 37-67)**; and b) in case of detection, by the base station, of a given pattern **(preamble)** transmitted by the mobile terminal, allocating a traffic channel emulating the radio interface of the first system, for communication with the mobile terminal **(col 23, lines 1-31)**, but fails to disclose monitoring mutual help channel of the first system by a base station of the second system. However, Raith in the invention of "Systems and Methods for Identifying Emergency Calls in Radio Communication Systems" disclosed a system and a method for monitoring emergency calls by an adjunct cell system **(item 550 of Fig 5)** initiated by a mobile terminal **(item 530 of Fig 5)** over an access channel within another cell

served by a different base station (**item 510 of Fig 5**) (**col 5 lines 62-67, col 6, lines 1-63, lines Figs 2, 5**).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method of monitoring emergency calls by an adjunct cell system initiated by a mobile terminal over an access channel within another cell serviced by a different base station as taught by Raith in the system of Grilli et al to monitor mutual help channel of the first system by a base station of the second system. One is motivated in order to provide a fail safe emergency call monitoring capability in distinct radio systems when a mobile user initiates an emergency call in a second radio system which is distinct from the first radio system of the mobile user (**Raith, col 1, lines 54-65, col 2, lines 31-65**).

Regarding claims 2,9,11, Grilli et al disclosed that the given pattern (signals with preamble) is transmitted periodically by the mobile terminal over the air interface with a first periodicity, (**col 22,lines 37-45**) and wherein step a) comprises: monitoring signals during given periodic timeslots; measuring the power level at the frequency of the signal during said given periodic timeslots (**col 23, lines 48-65**); if this power level is greater than a given threshold (**best of the average power levels**), assigning a control logical channel dedicated to searching for the given pattern on the said mutual help channel (**col 17, lines 58-65**), the timeslots of said control logical channel having a second periodicity which is not proportional to said first periodicity (**col 18, lines 43-56**); and monitoring the signal during the timeslots of said control logical channel, while taking into account the characteristics (**predetermined criteria**) of the radio interface of the

first system (**col 18 lines 16-42, col 22, lines 46-62, col 27, lines 27-67**) but fails to disclose monitoring mutual help channel of the first system. However, Raith disclosed a method for monitoring emergency calls by initiated by a mobile terminal (**item 530 of Fig 5**) over an access channel during given periodic timeslots (**item 510 of Fig 5**) (**col 5 lines 62-67, col 6, lines 1-63, lines Figs 2, 5**).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method of monitoring emergency calls initiated by a mobile terminal over an access channel during periodic timeslots as taught by Raith in the system of Grilli et al to monitor mutual help channel in the first radio system. One is motivated in order to provide a fail safe emergency call monitoring capability in distinct radio systems when a mobile user initiates an emergency call (**Raith, col 1, lines 54-65, col 2, lines 31-65**).

Regarding claim 3, Grilli et al disclosed that said given periodic timeslots consist of at least some of the timeslots of a broadcasting logical channel set up on a downlink control physical channel specific to the base station (**col 3, lines 33-52**).

Regarding claim 4, Grilli et al disclosed that the mobile terminals of the second system are silent (**idle**) during said given periodic timeslots (**col 3, lines 1-32**).

Regarding claims 5, Grilli et al disclosed that the given pattern is a synchronization sequence inserted periodically into the frame of a traffic physical channel of the first system (**col 2, lines 31-40, col 3, lines 17-32**).

Regarding claims 6-7, Grilli et al disclosed that the allocation of the traffic channel is automatic (**soft handover, col 18, lines 3-11, col 21, lines 1-15**) and the allocation of the traffic channel is controlled by an operator (**col 22, lines 5-11**).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's argument, see remarks filed on 12/13/2007 with respect to rejection of claims 1-11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Examiner thanks the applicant(s) for further clarifying the mutual help channel interface between incompatible radio systems as recited in claims. Therefore, a new search was performed and a new reference has been used in claim rejections made in this office action.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to the attention to Venkatesh Haliyur whose phone number is 571-272-8616. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00AM to 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edan Orgad can be reached @ (571)-272-7884. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (571)-272-2600 or fax to 571-273-8300.

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

/Venkatesh Haliyur/

Examiner, Art Unit 2619

/Edan Orgad/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2619